

REMARKS

Claims 1-53 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated October 5, 2006, claims 1-53 were rejected. Claims 1, 8, 9, 22, 27, 34, 35, 48, and 53 have been amended. Claims 54-56 have been added. Support for new claim 54 can be found, for example, in Applicants' specification paragraph [0019]. Support for new claim 55 can be found, for example, in Applicants' specification paragraph [0035]. Support for new claim 56 can be found, for example, in Applicants' specification paragraph [0016]. No new matter has been added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B)

Claims 1-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,675). This rejection is traversed.

As amended, claim 1 now recites a method comprising "generating **an implicit** query based at least in part on the at least one keyword". (Emphasis added.) This feature of claim 1 is beneficial because an implicit search query can be generated without the user needing to switch focus to perform an explicit search. As described in the Background Section of Applicants' Specification, in many cases, a user may be unaware or may not remember that information is available regarding a particular subject, and thus may not perform an explicit search for the

information. The claimed invention includes the feature of generating an implicit query which results in the user having access to the potentially relevant information.

Ryan does not teach or suggest “generating an implicit query based at least in part on the at least one keyword.” Ryan describes a search engine system that operates based upon a user’s explicit keyword entry into an interface of the search engine. (See, e.g., Col. 4, ln. 49-51.) In contrast to the claimed invention, Ryan relies on the user to make an explicit query by entering a keyword into the search engine interface. In the claimed invention, an implicit query is generated based on a keyword extracted from the event, wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article, such as an email or a word processor file, for example. (For other examples of articles, see Applicants’ Specification, paragraph [0016].) There is no disclosure or suggestion in Ryan of generating an implicit search query. Therefore, at least for this reason, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Ryan.

As amended, claims 22, 27, 48, and 53 similarly recite “generating an implicit query”. Therefore, all arguments advanced above with reference to this limitation of claim 1 apply equally to claims 22, 27, 48 and 53. As the remainder of the claims depend either directly or indirectly from the patentable independent claims discussed above, all arguments advanced above with respect to independent claims are hereby incorporated so as to apply to these dependent claims as well. In addition, dependent claims 2-21, 23-26, 28-47, and 49-52, and new claims 54-56 recite other patentable features which further distinguish them from the prior art of record. Applicants submit that these dependent claims are patentable over Ryan by reason of their dependency, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

CONCLUSION

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending are patentable over the cited references, for at least the reasons given above, while not necessarily conceding any contention not specifically addressed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections of these claims and allowance of them.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,
Niniane Wang and Stephen R. Lawrence

Date: March 5, 2007

By: /Robin W. Reasoner/

Robin W. Reasoner, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 58,257
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7172
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: rreasoner@fenwick.com